UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,482	02/23/2005	Paul R. Simons	GB 020141	4905

24737 7590 03/17/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2437	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/525,482	SIMONS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHEWAYE GELAGAY	2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 February 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/31/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Applicant's application filed on 02/23/05. Claims 1-33 have been examined.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 8/13/04 has been considered. The submission is in compliance with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.97. The IDS has been considered by the examiner and Form PTO-1449 is signed and attached hereto.

Oath/Declaration

4. The Oath filed on 2/23/05 complies with all the requirements set forth in MPEP 602 and therefore is accepted.

Drawings

5. The drawings were received on 2/23/05. These drawings are accepted.

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification lacks proper outlining setting forth different sections like "Summary of Invention" "Background of the Invention" etc. Examiner suggests referring to the following guidelines that illustrates the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
    (1) Field of the Invention.
    (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: Claim 30 line 1 recites "a computer readable medium" that lacks proper antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 30 and 32-33 are objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "adapted" in the claim language brings ambiguity if such action is would be rendered by the device. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5 and 6 recite the term "and/or" that renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "and/or"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 30 recites "a computer readable medium" wherein the computer-readable medium is not defined in the disclosure. "A computer-readable medium" as broadly defined may include other forms of propagation and transmission media such as signals which are considered non-statutory. The full scope of the claim as properly read in light of the disclosure in not limited to statutory subject matter, therefore, the claim is non-statuary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-17, 20-22 and 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. (Schneier) US 5,978,475 in view of Jevans WO 00/25245.

As per claim 1:

Schneier teaches a method of generating a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between a first (10) and a second (20) data processing device, comprising the steps of:

the first device (i.e. U0) issuing a partial transaction log (63) to the second device (i.e. U1), the partial transaction log including identification data (*i.e. a unique identifier for this logfile*) and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry;* col. 17, lines 28-47*; U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

the second device issuing to the first device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log (66), the signed full log including said identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the second device (20). (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1*)

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29*; the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer… the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix his digital signature to the document before sending*) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic

transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudiable. (Abstract; Jevans)

As per claim 2:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses prior to the step of issuing the partial transaction log (63), the step of: establishing communication (61,62) between the first and second devices in order to effect a transaction and generate data associated with that transaction, at least some of the data so generated being used as said event data in said partial transaction log. (col. 17, lines 28-30; *U0 and U1 establish a secure connection*)

As per claim 3:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the transaction includes authentication (62) of the identity of at least one of the devices. (col. 17, lines 35-36; *X0=p, IDuo, IDu1,d, IDlog, A0, where IDu0, and IDu1 are unique identifiers for U0 and U1, respectively*)

As per claim 4:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the event data includes time

stamp information derived from at least one of the first device (10) and the second device (20). (col. 17, line 31*; d, a current timestamp*)

As per claim 5:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the event data and/or the further event data includes time stamp information derived from both the first device (10) and the second device (20). (col. 16, lines 30-48; *d0 is U0's timestamp….d1 is U1's timestamp*)

As per claim 6:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the identification data includes data uniquely identifying the first device (10) and/or the second device (20). (col. 17, lines 35-36; *X0=p, IDuo, IDu1,d, IDlog, A0, where IDu0, and IDu1 are unique identifiers for U0 and U1, respectively*)

As per claim 7:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the signed full log includes further event data added by the second device (20). (col. 17, line 50; X1= p, IDlog, hash (X0))

As per claim 8:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses at least one or more of: the partial log; the signed transaction log; and the re-signed transaction log are encrypted during transfer between the first (10) and second (20) devices. (col. 15, lines 4-23)

As per claim 9:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the first digital signature is applied using a private key of the second device, the counterpart public key being accessible to the first device. (col. 15, lines 4-52)

As per claim 10:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the second digital signature is applied using a private key of the first device, the counterpart public key being accessible to the second device. (col. 15, lines 4-52)

As per claim 11:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses including the steps of: issuing a data request (64) to a third device (40), by the second device (20), after receiving the partial transaction log (63) from the first device; (page 28, lines 5-10; *the customer may also verify the notary's digital signature, if the notary's signature was appended to the*

electronic transaction document) receiving (65) third party event data, by the second device from the third device (40) in response to the data request; (page 28, lines 5-10; *the customer may also verify the notary's digital signature, if the notary's signature was appended to the electronic transaction document*) including the third party event data into the signed full log (66) issued to the first device. (page 29, lines 1-13; *the notary's response may contain the electronic document …notary's digital signature*)

As per claim 12:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses in which the third party event data is secured by a third digital signature specific to the third device (40). (page 27, lines 22-27; *the notary encrypts checksum of the electronic transaction document and notarizes the electronic transaction document by affixing its digital signature*)

As per claim 13:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses in which the third party event data includes time stamp information independent of the first and second devices. (page 33, lines 5-18; *each document description, which is usually an identifier that has been attached to a particular document, customer name, data and time the document was issued*)

As per claim 14:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses the third party event data includes transaction authorization data. (page 27, lines 22-25; *the notary encrypts checksum of the electronic transaction document and notarizes the electronic transaction document by affixing its digital signature*)

As per claim 15:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses the third digital signature is applied using a private key of the third device (40), the counterpart public key being accessible to the first (10) and second (20) devices. (page 27, line 14 - page 28, line 10)

As per claim 16:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the first device (10) is a portable identification device and the second device (20) is an access control device for controlling access to a building, facility or resource. (col. 6, lines 54-62)

As per claim 17:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses the signed full log includes the contents of the partial transaction log modified by the second device. (col. 17, lines 53-65)

As per claim 20:

Schneier teaches a method of operating an access control device (20) to generate a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between a first device (10) and the access control device (20), comprising the steps of:

receiving from the first device, a partial transaction log (63), the partial transaction log including identification data and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry; col. 17, lines 28-47; U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

issuing to the first device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log (66), the signed full log including said identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the access control device. (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1*)

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29; *the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer... the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the*

merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix his digital signature to the document before sending) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudiable. (Abstract; Jevans)

As per claim 21:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses including the steps of: issuing a data request (64) to a third device, after receiving the partial transaction log (63) from the first device; (page 28, lines 5-10; *the customer may also verify the notary's digital signature, if the notary's signature was appended to the electronic transaction document*) receiving third party event data (65), from the third device in response to the data request; (page 28, lines 5-10; *the customer may also verify the notary's digital signature, if the notary's signature was appended to the electronic transaction document*) including the third party event data into the signed full log (66) issued to the first device. (page 29, lines 1-13; *the notary's response may contain the electronic document …notary's digital signature*)

As per claim 22:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses in which the signed full log

includes the contents of the partial transaction log modified by the second device (20). (col. 17, lines 53-65)

As per claim 25:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses the step of verifying the authenticity and integrity of the re-signed full log using a public key of the first device. (page 27, line 14 - page 28, line 10)

As per claim 26:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Schneier further discloses in which the access control device (20) is any of an electronic door lock, electronic gate lock, equipment control system, computer system, data processing or retrieval system, point of sale terminal, or vending machine, and in which the first device (10) is any of an electronic key, credit or debit card. (Figure 1A)

As per claim 27:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further discloses including the step of allowing the first device (10) access to a predetermined resource, by the access control device (20), only after receipt of the re-signed log by the access control device. (col. 17, lines 53-65)

As per claim 28:

Schneier a method of operating a first data processing device to generate a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between the first device (10) and a second data processing device (20), comprising the steps of:

issuing a partial transaction log (63) to the second device, the partial transaction log including identification data and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry; col. 17, lines 28-47; U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

receiving from the second device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log (66), the signed full log including said identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the second device. (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1*)

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29; *the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer… the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix*

his digital signature to the document before sending) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudable. (Abstract; Jevans)

As per claims 29-30:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Jevans further including the step of verifying the authenticity and integrity of the signed full log using a public key of the second device. (page 27, line 14 - page 28, line 10)

As per claim 31:

Schneier discloses an apparatus for generating a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between a first (10) and a second (20) data processing device, comprising:

means (11), in the first device, for issuing a partial transaction log to the second device, the partial transaction log including identification data and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry;* col. 17, lines 28-47; *U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

means (21), in the second device, for issuing to the first device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log, the signed full log including said

identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the second device. (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1)*

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29; *the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer… the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix his digital signature to the document before sending*) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudiable. (Abstract; Jevans)

As per claim 32:

Schneier discloses an access control device (20) adapted to generate a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between a first device (10) and the access control device, comprising:

means (21,25) for receiving from the first device, a partial transaction log, the partial transaction log including identification data and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry; col. 17, lines 28-47; U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

means (21) for issuing to the first device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log, the signed full log including said identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the access control device. (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1*)

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29; *the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer… the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix*

his digital signature to the document before sending) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudiable. (Abstract; Jevans)

As per claim 33:

Schneier discloses a data processing device (10) adapted to generate a secure transaction log recording transaction data established between the data processing device and a second data processing device (20), comprising:

means (11,15) for issuing a partial transaction log to the second device, the partial transaction log including identification data and event data associated with the transaction; (col. 11, lines 23-24; *the log entry type of the jth log entry*; col. 17, lines 28-47; *U0 forms and sends to U1 M0, U0 forms its first log entry, L0*)

means (11) for receiving from the second device, in response to the partial transaction log, a signed full log, the signed full log including said identification data and event data, secured by a first digital signature specific to the second device. (col. 17, lines 48-53; *U1 receives and verifies Mo. If it is correct, the U1 forms and sends to U0 M1*)

In addition, Schneier discloses that U0 receives and verifies M1 sent by U1. (col. 17, lines 53-65) Schneier does not explicitly disclose the first device issuing, in response to the signed full log (66), a re-signed full log (67) including said identification

data and said first digital signature, secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. Jevans in analogous art, however, discloses a re-signed full log including secured by a second digital signature specific to the first device. (page 27, line 12- page 28, line 29; *the merchant creates a transaction document, affixes signature, and encrypts the document ... and transmits the document to the customer… the response transaction document is checksummed and signed with customer and transmitted to the merchant….the merchant then transmits a copy of the document response ...may affix his digital signature to the document before sending*) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Schneier with Jevans in order conduct and audit electronic transactions that allows users to accept or reject received electronic transactions documents, wherein the acceptance is non-repudable. (Abstract; Jevans)

15. Claims 18-19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier et al. (Schneier) US 5,978,475 in view of Jevans WO 00/25245 and further in view of Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown) US 6,385,652.

As per claims 18 and 23:

The combination of Schneier and Jevans teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition Schneier further discloses the first device, issuing a partil log to the second device and the second device issuing to the first device a signed full log secured by the digital signature specific to the second device. In addition, Jevans further discloses the recipient may be able to add some data to the document and seal any added content against tampering. (page 22, lines 15-page 23, line 25) Both

references do not explicitly disclose the first device a revised transaction log comprising the contents of the signed full log modified by the first device; and the second device (20), in response to the revised partial log a revised signed full log secured by a digital signature specific to the second device. Brown in analogous art, however, discloses the first device a revised transaction log comprising the contents of the signed full log modified by the first device; and the second device (20), in response to the revised partial log a revised signed full log secured by a digital signature specific to the second device. (col. 11, lines 55-61; col. 17, lines 30-50) Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed Schneier and Jevans with Brown in order to authorize document modifications after both parties reach an agreement. (col. 17, lines 38-40; Brown)

As per claims 19 and 24:

The combination of Schneier, Jevans and Brown teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Brwon further discloses repeating the steps of issuing a revised partial transaction log and a revised signed full log until both the first and second devices are in agreement with the contents of the transaction log. (col. 11, lines 55-61; col. 17, lines 30-50)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437